

## BOOK REVIEW

**Tibor Laczkó and Catherine O. Ringen (eds.): *Approaches to Hungarian, Volume 12: Papers from the 2009 Debrecen Conference*.** Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011. pp x + 242.

This twelfth volume in the *Approaches to Hungarian* series includes eight papers previously presented at the 9th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian held at the University of Debrecen in 2009. These papers cover topics in a number of linguistic sub-disciplines, indeed many of the empirical and theoretical issues discussed relate to interaction between various aspects of linguistic structure (morphology, phonology, pragmatics, semantics, syntax). While the focus is on Hungarian, the aim is to situate this research in its wider context, meaning that this collection of papers is intended for a readership comprising scholars of Hungarian and generative linguists.

### **1. Hungarian external causatives: Monoclausal but bi-eventive (Huba Bartos)**

In the volume's first paper, Bartos addresses the issue of Hungarian external (or 'factitive') causatives, providing a purely syntactic analysis of this construction and its properties framed within the Minimalist Program (MP). He concurs with previous accounts which analyze this construction as being monoclausal, but rejects a lexical analysis on the basis that Hungarian external causatives are bi-eventive and amenable to a purely syntactic analysis.

The paper is divided into two parts. In the first part, a critical assessment is presented of the lexicalist analysis developed by Horvath & Sioni (2007; 2010; 2011), which is formulated within their approach to the typology of causative constructions based on the Lexicon–Syntax Parameter (Reinhart & Sioni 2005). Bartos re-examines some of the data

which Horvath and Siloni use to motivate their analysis, as well as introducing other relevant data which were not considered. In the second part, Bartos sketches an alternative syntactic analysis of Hungarian external causatives whose theoretical basis is broadly consistent with Marantz's (1997) anti-lexicalist model and which draws on previous proposals regarding the syntactic derivation of argument structure phenomena such as Pylkkänen (2008). In short, Bartos proposes that Hungarian external causatives are bi-eventive. The two event domains are encoded in this construction's syntactic structure and each contains an external argument ('subject role'). The monoclausality of the external causative is accounted for by proposing that the predicate substructure comprising the two event domains is embedded below a single functional architecture.

Bartos states that the two major motivations for his bi-eventive analysis are the facts concerning adverbial modification possibilities and the control of subjects in participials. With respect to adverbial modification, Bartos presents data which show that at least in the case of certain adverbials (e.g., manner, frequency) there are two events which can be independently modified. What is initially puzzling is that this is not true for agent-oriented adverbs – they can only modify the event of causation (cf. Japanese). Bartos proposes to account for this difference in terms of the distinct licensing of agent-oriented adverbs: these adverbs are licensed by a category that is external to the predicate domain and hence they can only scope over the whole event.

As for control of a participial subject, Bartos shows that either the causer or the causee can act as controller when the modifier, analysed as a small clause with a PRO subject, is a manner adverbial. This is expected if, as Bartos proposes, there are two event domains each with their own 'subject' that can be the controller.

Bartos' paper provides important clarifications in terms of both defining the relevant construction and identifying relevant data. However, cases of inter-speaker variation in grammaticality/acceptability judgements are reported which would benefit from a more in-depth investigation. As the author himself acknowledges, while this paper highlights some problematic issues for the Horvath–Siloni lexicalist analysis of external causatives in Hungarian, it does not rule out a lexicalist analysis completely. Rather, Bartos shows that not only is a syntactic derivation of Hungarian external causatives possible, it also accounts for more of the relevant data at this point. Clearly, Bartos' sketch of a potentially viable alternative is worthy of further investigation and any future analysis within the Horvath–Siloni framework must show that it can account for the Hungarian data that Bar-

tos discusses as being problematic for such a lexicalist approach. This paper contributes to the literature on Hungarian causative constructions, as well as to wider ongoing debates regarding whether causatives are formed in the lexicon or in the syntax and how we understand the typology of this construction.

## **2. (The non-existence of) secondary stress in Hungarian (Sylvia Blaho & Dániel Szeredi)**

Blaho–Szeredi explore whether there is evidence to support the proposal that secondary stress exists in Hungarian. The specific focus of their research is the purely phonological type of secondary stress characterized in Varga (2000) as the metrical requirement for secondary stress to occur on odd non-initial syllables in a non-compound word. Previous claims in the literature are not supported by the results of Blaho–Szeredi’s pilot acoustic studies: their results reveal no convincing evidence of an acoustic correlate to support the posited existence of secondary stress in Hungarian.

This study aims to fill an important gap. As the authors point out, the claim that secondary stress exists in Hungarian has seldom been questioned in the literature, despite the surprising fact that there appear to have been no previous attempts to confirm through experimental investigation that acoustic or articulatory correlates of this phenomenon exist. Rather, generalizations have been made on the basis of impressionistic accounts.

Blaho and Szeredi review and reject the phonological evidence for secondary stress presented by Varga (2000), taking issue both with the design of Varga’s experiment and his interpretation of its results, before presenting their own experimental work. In order to determine what phonetic evidence, if any, there is for secondary stress in this language, two experiments were undertaken. The first experiment, described as a preliminary study, analysed the speech of a single consultant who repeated an unspecified number of test sentences three times. The second experiment involved analysis of seven test sentences produced by six speakers that were similarly repeated three times. Blaho and Szeredi report that they did not find evidence of secondary stress in the results of either experiment. Consequently, there was no support for any of the three models of secondary stress placement which appear in the literature.

The potential phonetic indicators of secondary stress that are considered are fundamental frequency (pitch), vowel duration and intensity. In common with Varga, Blaho and Szeredi conclude that intensity is the most likely acoustic correlate of secondary stress. They rule out vowel du-

ration, and subsequently exclude this variable from consideration in their second experiment, on the basis of data elicited from a single speaker in Experiment 1. It seems premature to have eliminated a potential correlate given what the authors themselves describe as a small sample. More data is needed before a final conclusion can be drawn.

With respect to the stimuli used in the experiments, it would have been helpful to include details of the test sentences so that the reader could see the precise contexts of the target words. These words are described as appearing in post-verbal, post-focal position. In future work, it would be useful to compare results for the target words in different syntactic positions. For instance, pitch is dismissed as irrelevant (see Figure 9), but it has been claimed that in a non-neutral sentence, stress is 'eradicated' from post-verbal words (Kálmán 1985), so this result is to be expected regardless of the facts about secondary stress. Research exploring the interaction between syntax, information structure and prosody should provide useful further insights. Another issue worthy of future attention is the fact that the results of these experiments seem to call into question the correlation between intensity and stress more generally.

Blaho and Szeredi subject to empirical investigation claims that have for too long gone unquestioned. It is to be hoped that their pilot studies will be followed up by further rigorous, wide-ranging experiments that test production and perception of putative secondary stress in both spontaneous and non-spontaneous speech data.

### **3. The syntax–prosody interface and sentential complementation in Hungarian (Shinichiro Ishihara & Barbara Ürögdi)**

Similar to Blaho and Szeredi, Ishihara and Ürögdi seek to shed light on an issue which has hitherto not been the subject of experimental study, though this paper's focus is the syntax-prosody interface rather than the relationship between phonetics and phonology.

In their paper, Ishihara and Ürögdi investigate object clauses as the complements of factive and non-factive embedding verbs with respect to the syntax–prosody interface. These constructions are examples of interface phenomena: they involve interaction between different aspects of linguistic structure. Ishihara and Ürögdi consider a number of factors which have been claimed to be relevant to the analysis of sentential complementation, testing for the effects of factivity, givenness, contrastive focus and referentiality in a phonetic experiment. They conclude by considering the

wider theoretical implications of their findings for competing syntactic and semantic analyses of sentential complementation.

In the first half of the paper, a useful review of previous analyses and the relevant data is provided. Ishihara and Ürögdi argue that factivity and givenness are independent and should therefore be treated as separate factors. They follow de Cuba & Ürögdi (2009) in distinguishing between finite sentential complement clauses on the basis of referentiality (the invocation a reference set of some kind). Clauses selected by factive verbs are examples of referential CPs (RCPs), denoting propositions which do not have illocutionary force and thus do not represent speech acts; clauses selected by non-factive verbs can be either non-referential (NCPs), therefore denoting a speech act with illocutionary force, or RCPs. A diagnostic is introduced to distinguish between the two: the presence of an unfocused clausal expletive *azt* in the higher clause indicates an NCP.

The second half of the paper deals with an experiment in which the four factors of interest (factivity, givenness of the sentential complement, contrastive focus status of the sentential complement/main V, and the NCP–RCP distinction) are controlled and tested in order to determine if any of them have prosodic correlates. The results indicate that (i) factivity does not have an effect on prosody, (ii) givenness has an independent effect on prosody (a given embedded clause is realized with a flatter intonational contour than a novel one), and (iii) RCPs and NCPs are associated with distinct prosodic patterns – in the latter, fundamental frequency maximum values are higher than in the former.

In assessing the theoretical implications of their findings, Ishihara and Ürögdi adopt a derivational approach to the grammar and assume a direct mapping between syntax and prosody. They propose that the prosodic patterns which distinguish NCPs from RCPs reflect a fundamental difference in their syntax, namely that NCPs must be associated with preverbal position in the higher clause via raising. (It is stated that this position bears main sentence stress; however, as discussed in Hunyadi (2002) and Mycock (2010), this is not always the case.) Ishihara–Ürögdi claim that their findings support the analysis of sentential complement clauses proposed by de Cuba–Ürögdi (2009), rather than one which attempts to capture the difference between them in terms of factivity encoded in the syntax.

One possibility that is not discussed, because it is incompatible with the authors' theoretical assumptions, is that the differences in prosody reflect a pragmatic distinction (NCPs constitute speech acts with illocutionary force while RCPs do not) rather than a syntactic or syntactically encoded one. This possibility and its implications remain to be explored by

researchers working in other theoretical frameworks. Follow-up perception testing would be of interest in this respect.

Ishihara and Ürögdi's research illustrates how important careful experimental work is to understanding the complex interactions that may be involved in the case of such a construction, and also how speech data can provide new insights into phenomena which have previously been analysed largely in terms of their syntax alone.

#### 4. On a type of counterfactual construction (Katalin É. Kiss)

É. Kiss' contribution presents a Minimalist analysis of a modal construction that has a counterfactual reading. The construction in question is a main clause which obligatorily involves a conditional verb form and verb preposing. It expresses a kind of reproach that is uttered as a response, never 'out of the blue'. Based on previous work within the MP on the syntax of mood, É. Kiss proposes to account for the properties of this construction in terms of a Mood projection in the C-domain.

The paper contains a useful summary of five key syntactic properties for which any analysis of this construction must account (section 2). Notably, when this type of counterfactual 'reproaching' sentence involves negation, the particle used is *ne*, which also occurs in optatives and imperatives, rather than *nem*, which is found in conditional constructions, amongst others. This latter fact leads É. Kiss to reject an analysis of the reproaching sentence as a type of conditional despite the fact that this construction includes a conditional verb form. Section 3 follows up by addressing the issue of the mood of a reproaching sentence, given that it shares semantic features with not only optative and imperative but also conditional sentences. It is additionally compared to a similar, but not identical, construction found in Spanish. In section 4, a review is provided of influential work within the non-derivational generative approach to syntax. Building on analyses of Hungarian optative sentences (section 5), which are also a type of counterfactual, and imperative sentences (section 6), which have directive force, É. Kiss outlines a syntactic analysis of 'reproaching' sentences which aims to capture the respective features that the latter shares with each of the two former types of construction. She proposes that all three types of sentence involve a functional projection, MoodP, below the TopicP in the C-domain. The head of MoodP has a distinct feature specification: optative, imperative or reproaching. The presence of one of these operators triggers V-movement. In each case, the head of the MoodP merges with a phrase whose head bears a matching

modal feature (NonNeutP headed by a conditional verb form or NegP headed by *ne*, the modal negative particle). An imperative or reproaching Mood head must be adjacent to the head of the phrase with which it merges. É. Kiss states that this is presumably due to these two operators being phonologically empty; by contrast, the optative has an overt mood particle.

The construction discussed and analysed in this paper raises questions not only about the analysis of syntactic structure, but also about other aspects of linguistic structure and its organisation which remain to be answered. For example, prosodic prominence appears to be indicated through use of capital letters, though this is not specifically stated and this convention is followed in some but not all of the examples provided; compare (2a) and (2c) with (2b) and (2d). (It also seems to express an atypical prosodic pattern in at least one case, cf. (23d) in this paper and (23) in Mycock 2010, 277.) It is not made clear whether a specific pattern of prosody is crucial to this counterfactual construction. Further clarification is required, preferably supported by systematic experimental investigation if it is the case that a particular prosodic configuration is associated with this construction. This is especially important given the proposal that a close relationship exists between prosody and semantics in Hungarian (see Hunyadi 2002; Mycock 2010). Another area that may benefit from experimental research concerns acceptability judgements. Some sentences are reported as being marginal. A survey of speaker judgements may provide useful insights into the extent and possible source(s) of degraded acceptability, as well as into issues such as the reported asymmetry in the usage of available variants and their relative markedness. Finally, the formulation of full semantic analyses of the constructions that É. Kiss discusses in this paper represents an important next step in testing the claims upon which the proposed analysis is based and in setting them in a wider context. This is particularly so because while the proposed analysis captures the syntactic commonalities between the imperative, optative and reproaching sentences, the nature of the relationship between reproaching and conditional sentences remains to be fully explained.

### 5. Result states in Hungarian (Christopher Piñón)

Christopher Piñón's paper examines result states and their possible modification by certain temporal expressions. He proposes a semantic analysis, which he evaluates with respect to previous treatments of result states in

Hungarian formulated within different frameworks (Pustejovsky's (1991) syntax of event structure, dynamic semantics).

Piñón distinguishes between overtly and covertly expressed result states, capturing this difference in semantic terms by proposing that in the latter case the result state is contributed by the verb itself, whereas in the former case it is contributed by the predicate complement of the verb. He then presents an analysis which aims to account for the modification of result states by temporal expressions marked with the sublative case. Piñón argues that three readings are available for these temporal modifiers, citing examples which show the differences between them: an actuality-based use, which defines the duration of the result state; an intention-based use, which defines the duration of the result state as intended by the volitional participant that may differ from the actual duration of the result state; and an incorporated use, which defines the duration of a state that is incorporated in the result state without any specification of the volitional participant's intention. Piñón rejects a posited fourth reading of a sublative case-marked temporal modifier – an 'existential use' or 'goal adverbial sense' – on the basis that it can be subsumed under his analysis of the intention-based use.

The third section of the paper evaluates two other approaches to result states in Hungarian. Piñón's approach differs fundamentally from the first of these approaches, Kiefer (2006), in identifying an accomplishment as possibly but not necessarily encoding a result state. He takes issue with both the introduction and the definitions of the predicates REV (reversible) and CON (control), which are key to Kiefer's analysis of result states and their interaction with sublative-marked temporal modifiers. Piñón further questions treating the relationship between reversibility and these modifiers in terms of a semantic condition rather than as a pragmatic implicature of their use. Piñón also briefly reviews Bende-Farkas's (2007) analysis of result states as involving dynamic asymmetric merge of a resultative predicate with a verbal predicate, which also incorporates the functions *Res* and *Cause*. While acknowledging the potential of such an approach, Piñón notes that several major issues remain to be addressed before Bende-Farkas (2007) could be considered a full account of result states in Hungarian.

The paper concludes with a discussion of data that potentially undermine Piñón's proposed analysis. For each of three problematic verbs identified, Piñón offers a different explanation for the unacceptability of an accompanying sublative-marked temporal modifier: (i) the unacceptability is not related to the verb's semantics (*kivasal* 'out-iron'), (ii) the verb does



not entail a result state (*becsap* ‘in-slam’), or (iii) the verb entails a result state that lasts forever and thus cannot be modified by a temporal expression that restricts duration (*bebizonyt* ‘PREVERB-prove’). The definition of (ii) appears to be consistent with it being a semelfactive verb – Kiss (2011) discusses semelfactive verbs in Hungarian and English – but Piñón does not explicitly raise this possibility. It is not clear why. With respect to (i), which of the explanations presented I found least convincing, Piñón supports his analysis of *kivasal* by appealing to intuition and a dictionary definition that does not unambiguously refer to the ‘free from creases’ result state which he assumes. It also remains to be determined whether the alternative analysis proposed by Gyuris (2003) of the unacceptability of *kivasal* with a sublative-marked temporal modifier does in fact relate to a different sense of the verb in question, as Piñón speculates.

In proposing this account of result states in Hungarian, Piñón seeks to address issues that have previously been raised in the literature, in addition to others that have not. This work should stimulate further discussion on and investigation into the semantics of result states, as well as their interaction with modifiers.

## 6. Paradigmatic variation in Hungarian (Péter Rebrus & Miklós Törkenczy)

Rebrus and Törkenczy consider Hungarian verbal paradigms and the variation that they can exhibit. They identify inter- and intra-speaker variation as resulting from conflicts between analogical and markedness constraints in the cases of verb stems that have vowel-zero alternation and definiteness marking in the present and past indicative.

The main focus of Rebrus and Törkenczy’s paper is the concept of instability in a paradigm and how this, together with the notion of optimisation, can account for systematic intra- and inter-speaker variation. The authors claim that unstable points exist when there is conflict between (i) markedness constraints and (ii) analogical requirements that have roughly equal strength (strength being determined by how often forms occur within the paradigm, meaning that frequency would have to be incorporated into the optimisation model). As a result, multiple forms will be available to speakers at these ‘weak’ points within the paradigm, from which they will select one. The claim is that this is the source of attested microvariation. Rebrus and Törkenczy investigate this proposal with respect to the verbal paradigm in Hungarian, specifically they examine intra-speaker variation in the stem allomorph used before quasi-analytic suffixes in the case of ‘epenthetic’ *ik*-verbs (section 4) and variation across Hun-

garian dialects in the form of the suffix that marks the definiteness of a verb's direct object (section 5). In each case, they describe how uniformity constraints represent competing pressures which result in unstable points in the paradigm precisely where there is evidence of variation. The authors also provide explanations for dialectal variation that are not due solely to competing uniformity constraints. In sections 6 and 7, they describe and discuss variation in certain parts of the definite present tense conditional verb paradigm (the 1st person plural and 3rd person singular forms, respectively). These examples serve to illustrate how form can be determined by uniformity constraints interacting with paradigmatic contrast, markedness and templatic constraints. Section 8 extends the proposed analysis to the indicative, a paradigm in which multiple forms exhibit variation. The paper ends with a useful discussion of three issues which could be considered problematic for the analysis that Rebrus and Törkenczy outline and which should guide future research: the quantification of degrees of morphological and phonological similarity/contrast, coupled with the weighting algorithm which applies to determine optimisation; the possibility that constraint conflict can result in paradigmatic defectiveness rather than variation, and the circumstances under which these alternatives are found; and what determines the occurrence of a particular variant.

In order to test the proposed analysis further and to address the points raised by the authors in the last part of their paper, a fuller picture of the variation which exists is required to augment the data cited here (i.e., Imre's 1971 book on Hungarian dialects, corpus searches and the authors' native-speaker intuitions). This should help to determine if more systematic patterns of variation exist and, if they do, to pinpoint the relevant variables. Frequency data will be of particular interest, as competing forms are not necessarily equally acceptable. For example, when selecting the stem allomorph of an 'epenthetic' *ik*-verb to be used before a quasi-analytic suffix, the authors state that speakers may be uncertain or strongly prefer one of the forms, a point supported by the number of Google hits that they report for variant forms of two verbs. This is claimed to be an idiolectal difference. It would be interesting to see if more data revealed a correlation with other constraints or factors. The same is true with respect to obtaining a more comprehensive understanding of dialect-by-dialect variation. More data would enable claims about constraints and their relative rankings to be tested more fully. In addition, Rebrus and Törkenczy's approach to paradigmatic variation has the potential to account for microvariation in languages other than Hungarian. This represents another possible direction for future research.

## **7. An interface account of identificational focus movement (Balázs Surányi)**

Surányi's paper on identificational focus is another which adopts a Chomskyan transformational approach to the analysis of Hungarian. The author moves away from recent cartographic approaches, according to which discourse functions are encoded in the syntactic structure through projections such as the Focus Phrase (FocP). Instead, Surányi offers an alternative analysis framed in terms of interface properties. He proposes that it is the interaction of these properties with the semantic (SEM) and phonological (PHON) components of language that determines which surface syntactic position the focus constituent occupies. Surányi evaluates other transformational analyses in light of the syntactic and prosodic features of identificational focus in Hungarian which he identifies.

Surányi proposes to capture two "inescapable interface properties" of the identificational focus (id-focus) construction, which has an exhaustive interpretation, namely its interpretation as an identificational predicate and its prosodic prominence. In section 2, he reviews the mainstream cartographic approach to Hungarian and in particular the left periphery, along with data relating to the relative scope of operators which present a challenge to such analyses because they would require multiple instances of the same type of projection to exist in the hierarchical syntactic structure. Section 3 deals with the posited interface properties of id-focus. The Hungarian Focus Construction and the type of Specificational Copular Clause found in English are compared and contrasted, before it is concluded that – while their interpretation is analogous in certain important respects – the constructions are not identical, a position supported by data which indicate that a number of syntactic properties distinguish the two construction types. In the second part of this section, a particular type of relationship between stress and focus is outlined. The claim advanced is that an id-focus constituent in Hungarian satisfies Stress–Focus Correspondence because it contains the prosodically most prominent syllable in its domain.

Following a useful sketch of the basic derivational analysis of Hungarian clause structure and the semantics of tense operators within this framework, section 4 is devoted to Surányi's interface analysis. He proposes that movement of an id-focus constituent is triggered by its semantics, specifically by the need to avoid a type conflict. The id-focus phrase must occupy a position from which it can compose with a predicate of temporal predicates in order for it to be interpretable. It is claimed that

the reason why this movement is overt rather than covert relates to Stress–Focus Correspondence. The requirement for id-focus to bear main stress within its domain can be achieved either by shifting the location of the stress or by overt movement of the id-focus expression. Surányi proposes that the former is configurationally more costly than the latter so overt movement is triggered, though it is unclear what independent evidence there is to support this assumption. This contrasts with examples of ‘ordinary focus’, which can remain in situ because there is no type conflict and hence no semantic motivation for any such movement. The proposed analysis of id-focus decouples verb-movement from (id-)focus fronting. Surányi concludes this section by exploring some of the implications of his proposed analysis, e.g., with respect to multiple foci constructions, infinitival clauses and sentences including preverbal distributive quantifiers and focus expressions. In the conclusion, issues for future work are highlighted, including the possibility that this ‘interface’ approach could be augmented with OT in order to capture some facts about variation.

The analysis sketched by Surányi provides a basis for the development of an alternative non-cartographic approach to focus in Hungarian within a derivational framework. In future work, it will be interesting to see his proposals tested against a full range of relevant speech data, preferably based on experimental investigation. It is not clear, for instance, how this approach would capture data presented in Mycock (2010). For example, in multiple question-word questions which elicit pair-list answers, the final preverbal question-word bears main stress (a sharp falling pitch accent), while the ones which precede it form a high plateau within the same Intonational Phrase, a pattern not discussed in this particular paper. While this is not an example of id-focus, it is important to understand how this and other types of focus fit into the overall picture. Testing the proposed analysis against spoken data will determine the viability of this alternative approach to focus not only in Hungarian, but potentially in other languages too.

## **8. Non-referential readings of null subjects in Hungarian (Ildikó Tóth)**

Tóth draws on a range of empirical evidence in order to investigate the different possible interpretations that arbitrary null subjects with 3rd person plural (3pl) agreement on the verb receive and to formulate an analysis expressed within the MP. The interpretations which such subjects receive are analysed as being the result of complex lexical, semantic, pragmatic and syntactic interactions, combined with knowledge of the immediate

context/the world in general. The main proposal in this paper is that non-referential null subjects are best analyzed as indefinite expressions whose contribution to meaning is – like their overt lexical counterparts – a variable, which must be bound either by an operator or by existential closure. The paper concludes with a discussion of the typology of non-referential null subjects with 3rd person agreement.

Tóth begins by distinguishing between two key concepts: ‘arbitrary’ and ‘generic’. An arbitrary reading is defined as a non-referential reading excluding the speaker and the addressee, while a generic reading includes them. When a non-referential null subject co-occurs with 3pl agreement marking on the verb, its interpretation can be either quasi-existential or quasi-universal depending on the sentence’s tense and aspectual features. In both cases, the speaker and addressee are excluded from the reading.

Next, Tóth introduces and discusses evidence which either supports or potentially undermines an analysis of non-referential null subjects as indefinites. For example, she shows that the interpretation of a null subject in an episodic sentence is determined by context and cannot be subsumed under conditions relating to theta-role, agentivity or state/activity. The fact that the universal arbitrary reading is available for overt indefinites when it is not always available for null subjects initially represents a challenge to Tóth’s indefinites analysis. After reviewing and rejecting elements of Condoravdi’s (1989) approach to this issue, Tóth outlines an alternative based on the proposal that this particular reading of null subjects arises because they act as plural indefinites and can receive a ‘functional reading’ due to the presence of a place or time adverbial which serves to define the maximal set of persons associated with the stated location, excluding the speaker and addressee. This function has as its variable the one introduced by the null subject, i.e., the variable is not bound by existential closure or an operator in this case.

Given the assumption that without agreement marking a null argument lacks content, Tóth proposes that 3pl agreement on the verb permits an arbitrary reading because this is the default marking and it lacks a number feature, hence the ambiguity. The only semantic feature such a null subject will receive is [+human]. Arbitrary interpretations are not available when the 3pl agreement marking occurs on an infinitive verb form though. Tóth accounts for this difference by claiming that in this case, in contrast to the equivalent marking on a finite verb form, 3pl does not represent default agreement marking, but rather carries a referential interpretation which precludes ambiguity. (This also explains the unavailability of a non-referential reading of a possessive construction with the

same 3pl agreement marking.) However, this proposal lacks independent justification: while the 3pl agreement morpheme has a distinct realization depending on whether the verb is finite or not, no other evidence supports the claim that the 3pl agreement morpheme used with an infinitive represents default agreement.

This paper presents a detailed account of the possible contexts and interpretations of arbitrary null subjects in Hungarian and places them within a wider typological setting. Tóth states that the patterns identified in Hungarian exemplify two of the eleven category combinations hitherto “missing” from Sigurðsson & Egerland’s (2009) typology of null subjects with 3rd person agreement. Identifying examples of the other nine combinations and testing the prediction that the availability of default agreement will vary across paradigms in languages other than Hungarian are issues which await further research.

## 9. Conclusion

This latest volume in the *Approaches to Hungarian* series once more draws together work at the cutting edge of research on the Hungarian language. The papers in this volume reflect the variety of the empirical and theoretical research currently being undertaken on Hungarian and, to a lesser extent, the different frameworks within which the language is being explored. The findings and proposals presented in these papers demonstrate the type of insights that studies of Hungarian continue to provide, insights which serve to increase our knowledge of the structure of Hungarian as well as the structure of language more generally.

**Louise Mycock**

## References

- Bende-Farkas, Ágnes. 2007. Resultatives and dynam semantics. In M. Aloni, P. Dekker and F. Roelofsen (eds.) *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Amsterdam Colloquium*. Amsterdam: ILLC/University of Amsterdam. 55–60.
- Condoravdi, Cleo. 1989. Indefinite and generic pronouns. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 8. 71–84.
- Cuba, Carlos de and Barbara Ürögdi. 2009. Eliminating factivity from syntax: Sentential complementation in Hungarian. In M. den Dikken and R. M. Vago (eds.) *Approaches to Hungarian 11: Papers from the New York conference*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 29–64.

- Gyuris, Beáta. 2003. Az igék jelentése és az eseményszerkezet [Verb meaning and event structure]. In F. Kiefer (ed.) *Igék, főnevek, melléknevek. Előtanulmányok a mentális szótár szerkezetéről* [Verbs, nouns, adjectives: Preliminary studies on the structure of the mental lexicon]. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó. 9–31.
- Horvath, Julia and Tal Sioni. 2007. Causitivation and the lexicon–syntax parameter. Paper presented at Research Institute for Linguistics, Budapest, 7 September 2007.
- Horvath, Julia and Tal Sioni. 2010. Lexicon versus syntax: Evidence from morphological causatives. In M. Rappaport Hovav, E. Doron and I. Sichel (eds.) *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 153–176.
- Horvath, Julia and Tal Sioni. 2011. Causatives across components. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29. 657–704.
- Hunyadi, László. 2002. Hungarian sentence prosody and Universal Grammar: On the prosody–syntax interface. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Imre, Samu. 1971. *A magyar nyelvjáráások rendszere* [The system of Hungarian dialects]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kálmán, László. 1985. Word order in non-neutral sentences. In I. Kenesei (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian 1: Data and descriptions*. Szeged: JATE. 25–37.
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 2006. *Aspektus és akcióminőség, különös tekintettel a magyar nyelvre* [Aspect and Aktionsart – with special reference to Hungarian]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kiss, Katalin. 2011. Remarks on semelfactive verbs in English and Hungarian. *Argumentum* 7. 121–128.
- Marantz, Alec. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4. 201–225.
- Mycock, Louise. 2010. Prominence in Hungarian: Alignment and the syntax–prosody interface. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108. 265–297.
- Pustejovsky, James. 1991. The syntax of event structure. *Cognition* 41. 47–81.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Tal Sioni. 2005. The lexicon–syntax parameter: Reflexivization and other arity operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36. 389–436.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór and Verner Egerland. 2009. Impersonal null-subjects in Icelandic and elsewhere. *Studia Linguistica* 63. 158–185.
- Varga, László. 2000. A magyar mellékhangsúly fonológiai státusáról [On the phonological status of the Hungarian secondary stress]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 124. 99–108.